DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 983 RC 022 288

AUTHOR Wagstaff, Mark
TITLE Outdoor Leader Self-Awareness and its Relationship to Co-Leaders' Perceptions of Influence.
PUB DATE 1998-01-00
NOTE 14p.; In: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Research Symposium Proceedings (4th, Bradford Woods, IN, January 9-11, 1998); see RC 022 283.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adventure Education; Credibility; *Individual Power; Interpersonal Competence; *Leadership Qualities; *Outdoor Leadership; *Peer Evaluation; *Self Actualization; Self Concept; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Inner Direction (Psychology); *Self Awareness

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship between outdoor leader self-awareness and co-leaders' perceptions of leader influence. Thirty-three challenge course instructors for a major university in the Midwest operated as a peer group, working in instructor teams leading groups in an outdoor setting. Each instructor took a turn as leader of the day. All subjects completed the Personal Orientation Inventory, which measures an outdoor leader's level of self-awareness, and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, which reveals perceptions of co-leader influence. Results indicate that: perceptions of expert power were directly correlated with inner-directedness; perceptions of expert power were significantly related to age, with older instructors perceived as having stronger expert power bases; as an outdoor leader's age increased, the self-actualizing attribute of inner-directedness also increased; expert power was significantly related to work experience, with co-leaders' perceptions of an outdoor leader's expert power increasing as the leader gained work experience; outdoor leaders saw education as a determining factor influencing co-leaders' perceptions of expert power; and there was no significant difference between men and women in perceptions of power. (Contains 33 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

# OUTDOOR LEADER SELF-AWARENESS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CO-LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF INFLUENCE

Mark Wagstaff

Brevard College

ED 438 983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles H Yaple

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RC 022288

# OUTDOOR LEADER SELF-AWARENESS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CO-LEADERS' PERCEPTIONS OF INFLUENCE

Mark Wagstaff

Brevard College

## Introduction

Preparing individuals to lead safe, enjoyable, and environmentally sound adventure education activities represents a critical issue among adventure education professionals (Cockrell, 1991; Petzoldt, 1974; Priest, 1987). Two important domains that must be addressed when training outdoor leaders are the development of technical skills and leadership skills. Technical skill development typically involves the physical aspects of outdoor leadership such as navigation, reading whitewater or climbing anchor placement. Leadership development includes topics such as small group management, conflict resolution, communication enhancement, and self-assessment.

An area of leadership development that has not received widespread attention, due to its subjectivity, resides in the realm of personality development. A potentially important personality characteristic is the role of leader self-awareness. The adventure education literature is devoid of empirical studies that focus on the characteristic of leader self-awareness.

One potential way to view the influence of leader self-awareness is through an analysis of leader power as perceived by co-leaders (Wagstaff, 1997). The co-leader relationship directly influences the development and behavior of a group (Winter, 1976). When leader dyads exhibit functional or dysfunctional behavior, group members react to the behaviors of the leaders. For example, if co-leaders cannot find a method to handle their differences, the group sometimes mirrors leader behavior and experiences increased difficulty with intermember conflict and differentiation.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between outdoor leader self-awareness and co-leaders' perceptions of leader influence. Self-awareness was based on the concept of self-actualization (Maslow, 1968, 1970, 1971). The construct of influence was operationalized as power (French & Raven, 1959).

The importance of leader self-awareness is explored in other fields, including management (Bennis,1989; Covey, 1991; Kouzes and Posner, 1993) and psychology (Goleman,1995). Bennis believes that a person must know him/herself well in order to become an effective leader. Kouzes and Posner equate high levels of leader self-knowledge with credibility. In psychology, the concept of self-awareness receives attention in the popular literature on emotional intelligence. Goleman (1995) addresses self-awareness as a necessary tool for psychological health. He explains that the term metacognition used by psychologists refers to an awareness of thought process, while metamood could be used to encompass the awareness of moods. Goleman prefers to use the broad term of self-awareness as an ongoing attention to one's internal states or metamood. He defines self-awareness as, "a self-reflexive, introspective attention to one's own experience, sometimes called mindfulness" (p. 315). A challenge for

RC 022288

researchers lies in assessing the depth or level of individual self-awareness and its relationship to the art of leadership.

The concept of power appears to play a critical role in influencing the co-leader relationship. Many definitions are available to explain the concept of power; however, for the purpose of this study, definitions and an instrument to measure power have been taken from the management literature. "Power is seen as the ability of one party to influence the attitudes and/or behavior of another" (Rahim & Buntzman, 1989, p. 197). Self-knowledge can shape personality, form character, instill confidence and develop inner strengths" (p. 15). Power can be defined as an influence or exchange relation operationalized by observing the behavior of two or more interacting persons (Stogdill, 1974).

French and Raven's (1959) description of the five types of power continues to be useful as a way of identifying the types of power. The five types of classic power are as follows:

*Reward Power* is the ability to give rewards.

*Coercive Power* is the ability to punish or threaten punishment.

*Legitimate Power* is based on the position one holds or is given.

*Referent Power* is when a person is liked or admired (charisma).

*Expert Power* is based on an individual's knowledge and skills.

For the purpose of this study, only referent and expert power are studied due to their idiosyncratic connection to personality. Referent and expert power, theoretically, appear to be the primary types of power linked to self-awareness because they are more character and personality based according to Student (1968). Knoop (1992) claims that, "knowledge of one's qualities, character, abilities and effects is a prerequisite for using power effectively.

James MacGregor Burns (1978), a political scientist, historian and social philosopher, addresses self-awareness through the larger construct called self-actualization in his book on leadership. Burns agrees with the humanistic psychologist that self-actualization includes the ability to self-assess in a state of reflexive self-awareness. Burns suggests that self-actualizers have a distinct capacity to learn from others and the environment. "Self-actualization ultimately means the ability to lead by being led. It is this kind of self-actualization that enables leaders to comprehend the needs of followers, to enter into their perspectives, and to act on popular needs such as those for material help and for security and esteem."

For the purpose of this study, the attribute of self-awareness is also studied as part of a larger theoretical construct called self-actualization (Maslow, 1968, 1970, 1971). Maslow's concept of self-actualization as a human need further enriches the view of a more self-aware, more highly developed individual. "Maslow has developed the idea of the self-actualizing person - a person who is more fully functioning and lives a more enriched life than does the average person" (Shostrom, 1964, p. 207). Maslow describes self-actualizers as highly creative individuals who have the ability to transcend culture and practice universal values (Ayers, 1994).

Maslow's basic assumption is that people strive to be exceptional rather than normal. The extent to which the striving is satisfied dictates what is considered to be self-actualized. Maslow (1970) describes the self-actualized as having a genuine desire to help the human race. People behave with less self-consciousness, accept themselves, have closer interpersonal relationships, show

less ego involvement and act in a kinder manner than non self-actualizing people. Maslow says self-actualizers are individuals who tend to exercise democratic values in all relationships. Self-actualizers behave naturally and simply with a lack artificiality or straining effect. These individuals tend to value solitude and privacy more than the average person.

Everett Shostrom (1963, 1964) developed the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) as a way to operationalize Maslow's concept of self-actualization. Shostrom perceived a need for a measure that would provide therapists with an estimate of a client's positive mental health. Items from the POI are scored on two primary scales, Inner-Directed Support and Time Competence, are used to measure two major areas: (1) personal and interpersonal development, and (2) time and support orientation. In order to provide a more in-depth conceptual framework for understanding these two terms, the following detailed descriptions are provided in the *POI Manual* (Shostrom, 1963, pp. 13-18):

Time Competency (Tc): The Tc self-actualizing (S-a) person is primarily time competent and, thus, appears to live more fully in the here-and-now. This person is able to tie the past and the future to the present in meaningful continuity and appears to be less burdened by guilt, regrets, and resentments from the past than is the non-self-actualizing person. Aspirations are tied meaningfully to present working goals. The self-actualizing individual's past and future orientations are depicted as reflecting positive mental health to the extent that the past is used for reflective thought and the future is tied to present goals.

Non-self-actualizing persons do not discriminate well between past or future. This person may be excessively concerned with either the past or future. A past-oriented person may be characterized as guilty, regretful, remorseful, blaming and resentful. This is the person haunted by undigested memories. The future-oriented person lives with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions and fears. This person obsesses over the future.

There are also people who are seen as only present oriented. A present oriented person is an individual who does not use his or her past to contribute to the present in a meaningful way and has no future goals tied to present activity. This type of person is often viewed as an unreflective busy person who actively avoids facing himself.

Inner-directed (I): The (I) person goes through life apparently independent, but still obeying the internal piloting system which is influenced by parents and other authority figures. The source of direction for the individual is inner in the sense that internal motivations are the guiding force rather than external influences. The other-directed person appears to have developed a system of influence and support far wider than parents. The primary control feeling tends to be fear or anxiety of fluctuating voices such as school authorities and peers. There is a danger that the other-directed person will be oversensitive to other's opinions in matters of external conformity. Manipulation in the form of pleasing others and insuring constant acceptance becomes the primary method of relating. The feeling of fear can be transformed into an obsessive, insatiable need for affection or reassurance of being loved.

## Method

The subjects for this study consisted of outdoor leaders ($N$=33) who served as challenge course instructors for a major university in the Midwest. All challenge

course instructors worked as part-time employees and were certified challenge course instructors by the employing university. The sample group consisted of 17 females and 16 males with ages ranging from 20 to 50 and an average age of 29. Work experience ranged from 2 months to 144 months, with an average work experience of 28 months. Educational levels ranged from current college undergraduates to individuals who had completed masters degrees. These instructors typically facilitated one-day challenge course experiences for a variety of groups ranging in size from 10 to 50 people. Examples of group types included church groups, youth organizations, university student
and faculty groups, therapy groups, corporate groups, school groups, military groups, drug prevention programs, family gatherings and summer camps.

The challenge course instructors (CCIs) led groups in an outdoor setting, through a progression of games and other activities to foster team work, communication, leadership development, self-confidence, and other group goals. All subjects in this study were required to successfully complete a four-day, in-house certification workshop before being employed. The sample instructor pool for this study operated as a peer group working in instructor teams ranging from 2 to 5 individuals. The course administrator randomly assigned, one month in advance, a leader of the day (LOD) among the scheduled instructor team for any given day. All certified instructors were afforded the chance to serve as LOD and assumed the responsibilities as outlined by the course administrator. The instructor team arrived in advance of groups to plan the day and remained afterwards to evaluate the experience among themselves.

**Instrumentation**

All 33 subjects completed the instruments described below for analysis. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was utilized to describe an outdoor leader's level of self-awareness, and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was used to obtain perceptions of co-leader influence. The following section provides a description for each instrument and methods of scoring.

The POI is a self-administered questionnaire designed for respondents with mental ages of 14 and above. It consists of 150 two-choice comparative-value judgment items. Examinees are asked to select the one statement of each pair that is most true of themselves. A profile of measures results from the POI which reflects the theoretical concepts and characteristics of a self-actualizing person as proposed by Maslow (1970, 1971). Testing time averages approximately 30 minutes. Individual responses to items are grouped into the two major scales, Time Competency (Tc) and Inner-directedness (I), and compared to normative samples resulting in a standard score. Raw scores from the POI are converted into standard scores utilizing adult norms. The mean standard score for the scale was 50, with a standard deviation of 10.

Discriminate validity for the POI was demonstrated by Shostrom (1964) when two groups, composed of self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing people, were tested. Concurrent validity has been demonstrated by Shostrom and Knapp (1966), Hathaway and McKinley, (1951) and Fox, Knapp, and Michael (1968). Test-retest methods established reliability coefficients of .91 and .93 for the POI (Shostrom, 1964). Reliability coefficients for the major scales of Time Competence at .71 and Inner-direction at .77 are reported in the *POI Manual*. Shostrom (1973) stated that the POI was not prone to distortion and fakeability as

reported in a number of studies (Braun & La Faro, 1969; Fisher & Silverstein, 1969a, 1969b; Foulds & Warehime, 1971).

A second instrument, the RLPI, was used in this study as a way to assess co-leaders' perceptions of expert and referent power among the challenge course instructors. Rahim (1988) created the RLPI based on French and Raven's (1959) power bases, which look at a subordinate's perceptions of a supervisor's power bases. During the development of the RLPI, Rahim (1988) conducted successive administrations to a subject pool of 198, 85, 84 groups of college students respectively and 108, 64, 600 groups of organizational members respectively. A 35-item questionnaire cast on a 5-point Likert Scale containing 7 items per power base resulted from the above procedures. Rahim utilized the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale (SDS) (Crowne & Marlowe,
(1960) to check the extent to which subjects responded to RLPI items in a socially desirable manner. Pearson's correlations between the SDS and the RLPI subscales showed no significant correlations, which provides some evidence that the power subscales are free from social desirability response bias.

Rahim (1988) tested his instrument by conducting two more studies using 476 executives and 297 students with work experience. The construct validity was partly tested through factor analyses. Criterion-related validity of the RLPI was tested using multiple regression analysis against the measure of compliance with supervisor's directives and wishes. The results show that the legitimate, expert and referent power bases positively influenced compliance (Rahim, 1988). The retest and internal consistency reliability coefficients for the RLPI subscales were satisfactory. No significant correlations were found between social desirability response set and power subscales in the collegiate sample.

For the purpose of this study, questions were reworded slightly to fit the challenge course co-worker context (Wagstaff, 1997). The test consists of 12 items split so that 6 questions assessed both the referent and expert power indices. Only expert and referent subscales were measured; therefore, legitimate, coercive and reward power subscales were not assessed. The RLPI assessments are based on a 5 point Likert-scale with 5 representing a higher score or stronger power base and 1 representing a lower score or weaker power base.

Subjects completed an RLPI assessment of each instructor with whom they co-led a group. Since not all subjects had co-instructed with one another, some questionnaires were left blank. The range of responses received per individual ranged from 12 to 29 responses. In other words, some instructors co-led with only 12 other people during their employment while others co-led with 29 other instructors at least once. Each subject was rated by 12 to 29 raters, (for example, 12 raters would produce 12 referent and 12 expert power scores). For each subject, a numerical rating of expert and referent power was calculated as follows. First, individual rater averages per instrument were calculated for each subject. Next, all rater averages were combined and averaged to calculate a mean of the means. Based on the scoring method developed by the researcher of this study, the mean of the means score provided the overall power scores for both the expert and referent power scales per subject.

**Results**

The means and standard deviations for power scores and POI scale scores for

the entire sample of outdoor leaders is summarized in Table 1. Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations of POI and power scores broken down into subgroups by age, work experience, educational level and gender. Pearson *r*'s were computed for analysis of correspondence between perceptions of expert and referent power and POI scale scores. Perceptions of expert and referent power and both POI scale scores were found to have low to moderate associations. For expert power the coefficients calculated were .171 for Time Competency and .357 for Inner-directedness; for referent power coefficients for Time Competency were .156 and .198 for Inner-directedness. Shavelson (1988) states that correlation coefficients of .30 or less demonstrate a low magnitude or weak association between variables. A coefficient between .30 and .60 is considered to demonstrate a moderate association. Based on the findings, expert power demonstrates a stronger relationship of association with self-actualizing values than does referent power.

Table 1

Table of Means for Power Scores and POI Scale Scores

| *N*=33 | Mean | SD | Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| Power Scores | | | |
| Expert | 3.8 | .43 | 3.1-4.6 |
| Referent | 4.2 | .28 | 3.5-4.6 |
| POI Scale Scores | | | |
| Time Competence (Tc) | 44.1 | 10.6 | 25-58 |
| Inner Directed (I) | 49.9 | 7.2 | 36-62 |

## Age

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to analyze the relationship between chronological age and Time Competence and then Inner-directedness. The participants were divided into three subgroups: ages 21 to 23, (*n*=8); ages 24 to 30, (*n*=13); and ages 31 to 50, (*n*=12). No significant relationship was found when comparing Time Competence with an outdoor leader's age. A significant relationship was discovered between Inner-directedness and an outdoor leader's age, $F\ (2,30) = 7.52, p \leq .01$.

A post-hoc analysis determined that a significant difference with respect to Inner-directedness occurred between the youngest group (*M*=43.88) and the oldest group (*M*=54.50), $F\ (1,30) = 14.90, p \leq .001$. A significant difference in Inner-directedness was also discovered between the middle group (*M*=49.47) and the older group, $F\ (1,30) = 4.36$, $p \leq .05$, and the younger group, $F\ (1,30) = 4.25, p \leq .05$.

A one-way ANOVA between chronological age and expert power was first conducted, followed by a comparison with referent power. No significant relationship was found between co-leaders' perceptions of referent power and age. A significant relationship resulted when comparing perceptions of expert power with age, $F\ (2,30) = 5.50, p \leq .01$.

A post-hoc analysis determined that a significant difference in perceived expert power occurred between the youngest group (*M*=3.47) and the oldest group (*M*=4.03), $F\ (1,30) = 10.62$, $p \leq .01$. A

significant difference was also found between the middle group ($M$=3.89) and younger group, $F$ (1,30) = 6.10, $p \leq .05$. No significant differences in perceptions of expert power were found between the middle and older group.

Work Experience

The sample was divided into three subgroups: 2 to 12 months of work experience, ($n$=14); 13 to 24 months of work experience, ($n$=10); and more than 24 months of work experience, ($n$=9). Work experience was defined as the time period after completing the four-day instructor certification course. A one-way ANOVA showed no difference when comparing Time Competence with work experience. A significant relationship resulted when comparing Inner-directedness with work experience, $F$ (2,30) = 3.66, $p \leq .05$. A post-hoc analysis showed a significant difference in Inner-directedness only between the second group (13 to 24 months of work experience, $M$=45.80) and the third group (>24 months of work experience, $M$=54.00), $F$ (1,30) = 7.29, $p \leq .05$.

Table 2

Table of Means for Sample Subgroups

| Sub-groups | POI Tc Scale | | POI I Scale | | Expert Power | | Referent Power | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Mean* | *SD* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Mean* | *SD* | *Mean* | *SD* |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 21-23 ($n$=8) | 37.13 | 8.89 | 43.88 | 4.67 | 3.47 | .23 | 4.10 | .23 |
| 24-30 ($n$=13) | 44.46 | 10.74 | 49.47 | 7.02 | 3.89 | .34 | 4.26 | .21 |
| 31-50 ($n$=12) | 48.50 | 9.78 | 54.50 | 5.62 | 4.03 | .48 | 4.25 | .36 |
| Work Experience (Months) | | | | | | | | |
| 2-12 ($n$=14) | 44.14 | 11.23 | 50.29 | 7.43 | 3.53 | .32 | 4.20 | .33 |
| 13-24 ($n$=10) | 42.90 | 9.11 | 45.80 | 6.10 | 3.82 | .26 | 4.23 | .25 |
| >24 ($n$=9) | 45.56 | 12.21 | 54.00 | 5.81 | 4.33 | .21 | 4.24 | .22 |
| Educational Level | | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduates ($n$=12) | 41.75 | 10.96 | 48.00 | 6.80 | 3.65 | .36 | 4.17 | .23 |
| Baccalaureates ($n$=10) | 46.00 | 10.86 | 48.00 | 7.67 | 3.77 | .36 | 4.22 | .26 |
| Grad.Student/ Masters ($n$=11) | 45.09 | 10.57 | 53.88 | 5.93 | 4.09 | .46 | 4.27 | .34 |
| Gender | | | | | | | | |
| Male ($n$=16) | 43.94 | 9.97 | 49.75 | 6.82 | 3.91 | .44 | 4.19 | .24 |
| Female ($n$=17) | 44.35 | 11.66 | 50.12 | 7.66 | 3.76 | .41 | 4.26 | .31 |

No significant relationship was found between referent power and an outdoor leader's amount of work experience. A significant relationship resulted when comparing expert power with the amount of work experience accumulated by an outdoor leader, $F$ (2,30) = 23.12, $p \leq .001$. The resulting post-hoc analysis between the groups with 2 to 12 months of work experience ($M$=3.53) and 13 to 24 months of work experience ($M$=3.82) showed a significant difference in perceptions of expert power, $F$ (1,30) = 46.22, $p \leq .001$. Groups with 2 to 12 and more than 24 months ($M$=4.33) also resulted in a significant difference, $F$ (1,30) = 46.22, $p \leq .001$. A final post-hoc analysis between the groups with 13 to 24 and more than 24 months of work experience also resulted in a significant difference, $F$ (1,30) = 15.87, $p \leq .001$.

Educational Level

The sample was divided into three subgroups: undergraduates ($n$=12); com pleted bachelors degree ($n$=10); and graduate students or masters degree holders ($n$=11). A one-way ANOVA showed no significant relationship between Time Competence and the educational level of an outdoor leader. Also, no significant relationship was found when comparing Inner-directedness with an outdoor leader's educational level.

No significant relationship was found between co-leaders' perceptions of referent power and an outdoor leader's educational level. A significant relationship resulted when comparing perceptions of expert power with educational level, $F$ (2.30) = 3.88, $p \leq .05$. The post-hoc analysis of all three groups resulted in a significant difference in co-leaders' perceptions of expert power only between the first group of current undergraduate students ($M$=3.65) and the third group consisting of graduate students and master degree holders ($M$=4.09), $F$ (1,30) = 7.40, $p \leq .05$. No significant differences were found between any other groups.

Gender

The sample was divided into two subgroups: males ($n$=16) and females ($n$=17). A one-way ANOVA showed no significant relationship was found when comparing male and female Time Competency. Also, no significant relationship resulted when comparing male and female Inner-directedness.

No significant relationship was found between perceptions of referent power and gender (males, $M$=4.19 and females, $M$=4.26). Also, no significant relationship resulted when comparing expert power with gender (males, $M$=3.91 and females, $M$=3.76).

**Summary**

Perceptions of expert power are directly correlated to the attribute of Inner-directedness. Outdoor leaders who are perceived as having a strong expert power base show a greater reactivity orientation towards the self. They are more spontaneous to be themselves and are responsive to their own personal needs and feelings. More research should be conducted to further observe the relationship between expert power and self-actualizing values associated with Inner-directedness. How does the perception of possessing skills and knowledge as an expert relate to being more Inner-directed as opposed to other-directed? Answering this question would be beneficial in promoting the development of leader expertise beyond simple technical skill acquisition.

Time Competency (Tc) and Inner-directedness (I) were both expected to

show a relationship to age as found in prior studies (Knapp, 1990). Tc showed no relationship while differences in I scale scores were found between all three age groups. A significant relationship was found between perceptions of expert power and age. The youngest group of leaders was perceived by co-leaders as having weaker expert power bases. The middle and older aged groups were both perceived as having stronger expert power bases. As an outdoor leader's age increased, there was also an increase in the self-actualizing attribute of Inner-directedness.

The significant relationship between age and expert power may support the notion that perceptions of expertise do not transcend demographic characteristics such as age. This finding further links the concepts of Inner-directedness and expert power through the maturation process of age. The possibility also exists that perceptions of expert power are more prone to cultural biases perpetuated by the human socialization process. A potential research question to address this might be, "What specific factors influence varying perceptions of expert power within a specific cultural context?" When comparing power bases with age, no relationship was found between age and referent power. Therefore, one assumption might be that referent power is not affected by certain personality attributes such as age. Possibly, more discrete, psychological structures such as self-concept or self-efficacy affect a person's referent power base.

A significant relationship was found when comparing individuals' Inner-directedness with their amount of work experience as a challenge course instructor. Outdoor leaders who had
worked 13 to 24 months in this study appeared to be less Inner-directed than outdoor leaders who had worked for more than two years. A significant relationship resulted when comparing perceived expert power with work experience. As outdoor leaders gain work experience, co-leaders' perceptions of expert power also increase. Based on the findings of this study, the possibility exists that the quantity of work experience directly influences the co-leader relationship due to the increase in perceptions of expert power.

The results reinforce a common perception that an individual's degree of expertise increases as work experience increases. Further questions are raised by the new evidence that some type of relationship may exist between Inner-directedness and perceptions of expert power. For example, "Why are self-directed individuals perceived as experts?" The answer to this question may help develop a deeper understanding of perceptions of expert power.

A significant finding resulted when comparing perceptions of expert power with educational level. Undergraduate outdoor leaders were perceived to have a weaker expert power base than outdoor leaders who were graduate students or those who held masters degrees. Education is another potential attribute which could be seen among outdoor leaders as a determining factor influencing co-leaders' perceptions of expert power. The cohorts for this study actively participated in the institution of higher education and therefore may have associated their value of higher education with expertise. More studies should be conducted to assess the relationship between perceptions of expert power and educational level. Also, research needs to be conducted to determine how expert power actually affects co-leader relationships compared to other types of power.

Power and its relationship to gender in this study also deserves attention. The fact that there was no significant differ-

ence between men and women and perceptions of power has fascinating implications. Power and gender are contemporary issues that permeate all professions, including adventure education. This study provided some evidence that perceptions of power were equal among women and men in this study. Anecdotal comments made to the researcher by the subjects provided some insight. Several subjects shared that gender equity is modeled and taught within this particular organizational structure. The administrator's expectations applied to all employees equally, and infractions of disrespect for the opposite sex were confronted by the administration. This organizational norm was instilled during initial training and reinforced throughout employment. A research question to pursue based on this implication might be, "Does the management of an organization have direct influence over the perceptions of power between men and women co-workers?"

## Implications

Assessing the attribute of self-awareness within the context of self-actualization could prove to be beneficial in the training and development of outdoor leaders. Developing an individual's leadership skills presents a challenging task that holds no clear methodology as opposed to technical skill development. Self-awareness may be the psychological construct that allows leaders to access the interpersonal skills necessary to develop competent leadership skills. If self-awareness is defined within the context of self-actualization, trainers of outdoor leaders have a reference to formulate specific goals for leadership skill improvement.

The construct of power also deserves more attention as an important variable when studying outdoor leadership. French and Raven's (1959) view of power operationalized by the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) did produce thought-provoking results even though the small sample was a limitation in this study. The revised instrument used in this study could be used (with Dr. Rahim's permission) to assess the power indices within a large staff of outdoor leaders should power issues be a suspected problem. Using the tool could be a method to raise awareness and stimulate discussion. More research needs to be conducted to see if outdoor leaders perceive peers as experts based on age, work experience, and educational level. This knowledge could also be helpful in raising the awareness that hierarchies do exist and may help explain staffing patterns, organizational culture, and staff relationships.

The findings of this study have ramifications for Winter's (1976) model of co-leader roles and concerns. Evidence was found to support the notion that co-leaders perceived each other as experts based on age, level of education, and work experience. More research needs to be conducted to determine the exact effect of a strong expert power base within the co-leader relationship. For example two questions to ask might be: (1) are the working relationships more satisfying when there are perceptions of a strong co-leader expert power base or (2) do higher levels of leader expert power expedite functional group development? As recommended in this study, clarifying the definition and characteristics of expert power would further our understanding of co-leader relationships and group development.

## References

Ayers, J. B. (1994), Self-actualization. In Corsini, R.J. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychology, 3,* (2nd ed.). (pp. 359-360). NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. NY: Addison-Wesley.

Braun, J.R., & La Faro, D.A. (1969). A further study of the fakability of the Personal Orientation Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25*, 296-299.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper & Row.

Cockrell, D. (Ed.) (1991). *The wilderness educator: The Wilderness Education Association curriculum guide*. Merrillville, IN: ICS Books.

Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. NY: Summit Books.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 23*, 155-161.

Fisher, G., & Silverstein, A.B. (1969a). Simulation of poor adjustment on a measure of self-actualization. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25*, 198-199.

Fisher, G., & Silverstein, A.B. (1969b). Self-actualization values of felons. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 9*, 66-70.

Foulds, M.L., & Warehime, R.G. (1971). Effects of a "fake good" response set on a measure of self-actualization. *Journal of Counseling and Psychology, 18*, 279-280.

Fox, J., Knapp, R.R., & Michael, W.B. (1968). Assessment of self-actualization of psychiatric patients: Validity of the Personal Orientation Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 28*, 565-569.

French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright. *Studies in Social Power*, (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. NY: Bantam Books.

Hathaway, S.R., & McKinley, J.C. (1951). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. NY: The Psychological Corporation.

Knapp, R.R. (1990). *Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory*. San Diego, CA: EdITS/Educational Industrial Testing Service.

Knoop, R. (1992). Power tactics. *Education Canada*. Spring/Printemps, 15-19.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Maslow, A.H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). NY: Van Nostrand.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. (2nd ed.). NY: Harper & Row

Maslow, A.H. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. NY: Viking.

Petzoldt, P. (1974). *The wilderness handbook*. NY: W.W. Norton & Co.

Priest. S. (1987). An international survey of outdoor leadership preparation. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 10, 34-39.

Rahim, A.M. (1988). The development of a leader power inventory. *Mul-*

*tivariate Behavioral Research, 23,* 491-503.

Rahim, A.M., & Buntzman, G.F. (1989). Supervisory power bases, styles of handling conflict with subordinates, and subordinate compliance and satisfaction. *Journal of Psychology, 123,* 195-210.

Shavelson, R. J. (1988). *Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences.* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Shostrom, E.L. (1963). *Personal Orientation Inventory.* San Diego, CA: EdITS/ Educational & Industrial Testing Service.

Shostrom, E.L. (1964). An inventory for the measurement of self-actualization. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 24,* 207-218.

Shostrom, E.L. (1974). *Personal Orientation Inventory.* San Diego, CA: EdITS/ Educational & Industrial Testing Service.

Shostrom, E.L., & Knapp, R.R. (1966). The relationship of a measure of self-actualization (POI) to a measure of pathology (MMPI) and to therapeutic growth. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 32,* 628-632.

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* NY: Free Press.

Student, K.R. (1968). Supervisory influence and work-group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52,* 188-194.

Wagstaff, M.C. (1997). *Outdoor leader self-awareness and its relationship to co-leaders' perceptions of influence.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Winter, S.K. (1976). Developmental stages in the roles and concerns of group co-leaders. *Small Group Behavior, 7,* 349-363.

Mark Wagstaff, Assistant professor, Wilderness Leadership and Experiential Education, Brevard College, 400 North Broad Street, Brevard, NC, 28712. Phone: (828) 883-8946; Email: wagstaffm@brevard.edu

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors Fourth Research Symposium Proceedings

Author(s): Fox, Foti, et al (editors)

Corporate Source: Coalition for Education in the Outdoors

Publication Date: Jan 1998

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, please**

| | |
|---|---|
| Signature: Charles H. Yaple | Printed Name/Position/Title: CHARLES H. YAPLE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| Organization/Address: PARK CENTER SUNY CORTLAND CORTLAND, NY 13045 | Telephone: (607)-753-4968 FAX: (607)-753-5982 |
| | E-Mail Address: yaplec@cortland.edu Date: 2/16/00 |

sr)